



Supplementary Notebook (RTEP - Brazilian academic journal, ISSN 2316-1493)

REPRESENTATION OF A METAPHORICAL WORLDVIEW IN MODERN LINGUISTICS

Angelina Olegovna Maslakova ¹
 Alexander A. Denisov ²
 Alsou Zavidovna Korotkova ³
 Uliana Andreevna Kukina ⁴
 Natalia Vladimirovna Mosina ⁵

¹ *Moscow City University, Moscow, Russia. Angelina.korovina1@yandex.ru.*

² *Russian State Social University, Moscow, Russia. DenisovAA@rgsu.net.*

³ *Russian State Social University, Moscow, Russia. KorotkovaAZ@rgsu.net.*

⁴ *Russian State Social University, Moscow, Russia. KukinaUA@rgsu.net.*

⁵ *Russian State Social University, Moscow, Russia. MosinaNV@rgsu.net.*

Abstract: *This article looks at the role of metaphor in the development of the linguistic worldview and in the formation of certain images, which can be of individual national nature or coincide in different languages. Metaphor should be studied as a cognitive means and a culture-specific language layer that reflects the understanding of the world by speakers of different languages and representatives of various cultures.*

Keywords: *metaphorical transfer, linguistic worldview, linguacultural, conceptual system, concept, connotation.*

INTRODUCTION

The interconnection between culture, language, and consciousness is at the center of the attention of modern linguistics. At this stage, a lot of new research into the linguistic worldview is being carried out and various associative dictionaries are being created, containing a wide scope of material used to study the specific features of perception of reality in a certain culture. Therefore, it is necessary to research the role of language in the creation of a national and cultural worldview. Language is a sign organizer, which can connect the inner world of a person with the outer world. In the process of perception of the world, people record the main results of their cognition in language.

The connection between culture and language manifests itself in basic concepts, and they, in their turn, exist in each linguoculture. Linguistic and linguacultural

interpretation of data contained in language allows scholars to study them as a representation of constructs of conceptual consciousness. Since language exists as a material form reflecting human thinking, and people, in turn, possess certain knowledge at each stage of their lives, a new problem concerning the interpretation of the concept “worldview” arises. The worldview that is considered to be a body of human knowledge about the world is substituted for the worldview existing in the language, namely “linguistic worldview”. The very term “linguistic worldview” can be interpreted in different ways. According to B.A. Serebrennikov, there are two types of worldviews: conceptual and linguistic. The conceptual worldview is much richer than the linguistic one since several types of thinking are involved in the process of its formation at the same time: visual thinking, action thinking, logical thinking, and verbal thinking. However, these two types of worldviews are closely connected. Language could not be a means of communication if it was not connected with the conceptual worldview. Language characterizes individual elements of the conceptual worldview. This fact often shows in the formation of words, sentence and text linkers. Language can explain the conceptual worldview through the connection of words between each other in the process of speech. Therefore, a word is a constituent part of the worldview (Serebrennikov, 1988).

METHODS

During development of the methodology for this research, time-tested methods, frameworks, and approaches used in such disciplines as Stylistics, Language Studies, and Lexicology were applied. To deal with specific tasks, the method of expert assessment, generalization, induction, and deduction were used.

RESULTS

In this work, we regard the linguistic worldview as a body of knowledge about the world that is reflected in a certain linguistic form peculiar to each nation. Hence, the linguistic worldview, which has developed historically within the consciousness of a certain linguistic community and is reflected in language through a set of beliefs about the world, represents one of the most significant means of conceptualization of reality. Since this means is nation-specific, speakers of different languages see the world differently. As far as the term “metaphor” is concerned, it is used in two meanings in linguistics: as a result, and as a process. It is the latter aspect of metaphor that is directly connected with the anthropocentric factor in language. Due to its existence, linguistic means embrace the full national cultural wealth accumulated by linguistic communities of people throughout centuries (Ganyushina, Avtsinova, 2019). Any person has an opportunity not only to express their thoughts using metaphorical expressions in their speech but also to think with these expressive means, thus creating their own world.

Metaphors exist in every person’s conceptual system. According to the American linguist George Lakoff, metaphors are attributed the status of language units only because the human conceptual system is filled with them (Lakoff, Johnson, 2003). In turn, David Punter believes that metaphors are widely used not only in literature but also in modern language and everyday speech. Scholars think that people constantly use the communicative function of language in their speech. The speaker each time needs to make the listener or reader interested, and this goal is impossible to achieve without using metaphors (Punter, 2007). Most linguists who study this subject agree that the main

function of metaphor is to evoke associations, with the help of which a person perceives the surrounding world. Metaphor is the most important figure of speech that can form secondary names in the process of creation of a worldview allowing language users to build a special image of the world. This image results from the situation when metaphors enter the conceptual system of reflecting the reality and endow it with certain features peculiar to national and cultural traditions (Gabets, Khorokhorina, Orekhova, 2017).

On the basis thereof, many modern linguists contend that the linguistic worldview depends on the phenomenon of idiomaticity but, in general, is not reduced to it since it represents a product of verbal and thinking activity that can introduce semantic segmentation unique for each language into reality (Teliya, 1981). The linguistic worldview is understood as information scattered all over the conceptual framework and connected with the formation of concepts through the manipulation of linguistic meanings and their associative fields, which, accordingly, enriches the conceptual system. Elements comprising the linguistic worldview are the means of creating new concepts modified by human consciousness (Teliya, 1981). The linguistic worldview serves for the development of one's attitude to the world and establishes rules of conduct in it. The problem of the linguistic worldview is directly connected with the problem of metaphor since it performs the role of a prism that can identify something new with the help of something already explored and recorded as the meaning of a language unit. In this case, the image at the core of the metaphorical expression fulfills the function of an internal form with corresponding associations, which provides the speaker with a wide range of elements to interpret the denoted object and express various shades of meaning. S.S. Gusev, a scholar who studied the role of metaphor in the scientific worldview, writes that usage of metaphor can be explained by the fact that it is an irreplaceable device of acquiring new knowledge in the process of creating a wide associative field with the help of a limited number of expressive means (Gusev, 1984).

Modern researchers who look into this issue agree that the linguistic worldview is an inevitable product of consciousness resulting from the thinking and verbal activity; this product emerges in the course of interaction between thinking, reality, and language and conveys one's thoughts about the world during communication. Figural and verbal associations are used in the process of formation of concepts to impart a linguistic overtone to them, which constitutes a part of their content as a set of connotations. The linguistic worldview, full of metaphors, can fade away but this fact cannot interfere with the objective perception of reality since it can be decoded like any other metaphor. This process is simple, especially when metaphor carries associations that are customary to native speakers of the corresponding language. Therefore, many modern scholars believe that the linguistic worldview cannot have distinct boundaries and correlates with the conceptual model of the world since it reflects the elements of the conceptual system and fills the gaps in it with linguistic means (Hakobyan, Khorokhorina, Glukhova, E. (2016). It should be noted that the linguistic worldview can be found in those spheres of denoting reality where existing linguistic means have already been used to form new concepts. As a rule, these spheres can be studied by creating a body of objective knowledge.

CONCLUSION

The linguistic worldview of a certain nation is represented in the semantic aspect of the corresponding language. Analysis of this layer in different languages allows scientists to identify differences between national cultures. However, if all word meanings

were culturally specific, it would be impossible to study cultural differences. This is why it is necessary to take into account the universal features of language units during research into national and cultural aspects. The main factor reflecting both the universal and specific nature of a national linguistic worldview is the world perceived through the prism of secondary sensations. At the same time, it is important to remember the distinction between the universal human factor and national specific features of different linguistic worldviews. Being universal, the genetic mechanism of evaluating bodily sensations in the course of interaction with human activity, which is also universal but, at the same time, characterized by national specific features, unfailingly leads to the creation of linguistic worldviews with typologically common and individual features (Katermina, 2016).

REFERENCES

- 1 Gabets, A., Khorokhorina, G., Orekhova, E. (2017). Metaphor interpretation in business discourse. *SGEM International Multidisciplinary Scientific Conference on Social sciences and Arts*, 2(3), 833–840.
- 2 Ganyushina, M.A., Avtsinova, G.I. (2019). “Force/power” concept interpretation in political discourse: its linguistic associations and metaphorical correlations as a way of linguistic manipulation. *Economic and Social Development Book of Proceedings*.
- 3 Gusev, S.S. (1984). *Nauka i metafora [Science and metaphor]*. Leningrad: Nauka.
- 4 Hakobyan, K., Khorokhorina, G., Glukhova, E. (2016). Pragmastylistic aspects of the description of language. Sofia: 3rd SGEM International Multidisciplinary Scientific Conference on Social Sciences and Arts.
- 5 Katermina, V.V. (2016). *Nominatsii cheloveka: natsionalno-kulturnyi aspekt (na materiale russkogo i angliiskogo yazykov) [Nominations of people: the national and cultural aspects (a case study based on the Russian and English languages)]*. Moscow: FLINTA.
- 6 Lakoff, G., Johnson, M. (2003). *Metaphors we live by*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- 7 Punter, D. (2007). *Metaphor*. New York: Routledge.
- 8 Serebrennikov, B.A. (1988). *Rol chelovecheskogo faktora v yazyke [The role of the human factor in language. Language and thinking]*. Yazyk i kartina mira. Moscow: Nauka.
- 9 Teliya, V.N. (1981). *Metaforizatsiya i ee rol v sozdanii yazykovoi kartiny mira. Rol chelovecheskogo faktora v yazyke. Yazyk i kartina mira*. Moscow: Nauka.